IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

ARTEL HOPKINS, :

Petitioner,

.

v. : Civ. Act. No. 08-06-SLR

:

MICHAEL DELOY, Warden,

and JOSEPH R. BIDEN, III, Attorney

General of the State of Delaware,

:

Respondents.

MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

Pursuant to Rule 6 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, respondents move for an extension of time in which to file an answer to the petition. In support thereof, respondents state the following:

- 1. The petitioner, Artel Hopkins, has applied for federal habeas relief, filing a habeas petition challenging his 2004 convictions and sentence for trafficking in cocaine (100 grams or greater), possession with intent to deliver cocaine, maintaining a building for keeping controlled substances, second degree conspiracy, and possession of drug paraphernalia. D.I. 1. By the terms of the Court's order, the answer is due to be filed on April 25, 2008. D.I. 7.
- 2. Counsel has been, and continues to be, diligently working on several cases before this Court and the state courts, including three capital cases. Counsel, however, was not assigned this case until April 11, and since that time counsel has been required to spend considerable amounts of time on another case due to the United States Supreme Court's recent decision in *Baze v. Rees*. Counsel has completed portions of the answer, but needs additional time to fully address the issues in the petition. At this stage, it is not practical to reassign the case to another prosecutor.

3. Under Habeas Rule 4, the Court has the discretion to give respondents an extension of time exceeding the 40-day limit in Civil Rule 81(a)(2). *Clutchette v. Rushen*, 770 F.2d 1469, 1473-74 & n.4 (9th Cir. 1985); *Kramer v. Jenkins*, 108 F.R.D. 429, 431-32 (N.D. Ill. 1985). The comment to Rule 4 expressly states that the district court has "the discretion to take into account various factors such as the respondent's workload" in determining the period of time that should be allowed to answer the petition.

- 4. This is respondents' first request for an extension of time in this case.
- 5. Respondents submit that an extension of time to and including May 9, 2008, in which to file an answer is reasonable. Respondents submit herewith a proposed order.

/s/ Elizabeth R. McFarlan Deputy Attorney General Department of Justice 820 N. French Street Wilmington, DE 19801 (302) 577-8500 Del. Bar. ID No. 3759

DATE: April 23, 2008

RULE 7.1.1 CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that I have neither sought nor obtained the consent of the petitioner, who is in the custody of the Delaware Department of Correction and appearing *pro se*, to the subject matter of this motion.

/s/ Elizabeth R. McFarlan Deputy Attorney General

Counsel for Respondents

Date: April 23, 2008

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

ARTEL HOPKINS,	:
Petitioner,	: :
v.	: Civ. Act. No. 08-06-SLR
MICHAEL DELOY, Warden, and JOSEPH R. BIDEN, III, Attorney General of the State of Delaware, Respondents.	: : : : :
Troop on a small	OPPER
	ORDER
Thisday of	, 2008,
WHEREAS, respondents having re	equested an extension of time in which to file an answer,
and	
WHEREAS, it appearing to the Co	ourt that the requested extension is timely made and good
cause has been shown for the extension,	
IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that re-	spondents' answer shall be filed on or before May 9, 2008.
	United States District Judge

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on April 23, 2008, I electronically filed a motion for extension of time with the Clerk of Court using CM/ECF. I also hereby certify that on April 23, 2008, I have mailed by United States Postal Service, the same document to the following non-registered participant:

Artel Hopkins SBI 254263 Sussex Correctional Institution P.O. Box 500 Georgetown, DE 19947

/s/ Elizabeth R. McFarlan
Deputy Attorney General
Department of Justice
820 N. French Street
Wilmington, DE 19801
(302) 577-8500
Del. Bar. ID No. 3759
elizabeth.mcfarlan@state.de.us